

**Sacramento River Conservation Area  
Board of Directors  
Minutes**

July 26<sup>th</sup>, 2001  
4:00 p.m.

Willows City Hall  
Willows, Ca.

- 1) Chairman Ben Carter opened the meeting of the Sacramento River Conservation Area to order at 4:05 p.m. at the above location. It was determined there was a quorum of (13) voting members present.

<u>County</u>	<u>Public Interest</u>	<u>Landowner</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Butte	Jane Dolan	Shirley Lewis	
Colusa	Doug White	Ben Carter	
Glenn	Denny Bungarz	Don Anderson	
Shasta	Glenn Hawes	(Dan Gover)	
Sutter	Mary Keller Alt. (Dan Silva)	Russell Young	
Tehama	(Bill Borror)	Brendon Flynn	
Yolo	Lynnel Pollock	Marc Faye	

Resources Agency	Mel Dodgin
Cal DFG	Paul Ward (Diana Jacobs)
State Reclamation Board	(Pete Rabbon)
USF&WS	Dan Castleberry
US COE	Scott Clark (Mark Charlton)
Cal DWR	(Dwight Russell)
Bureau of Reclamation	Laura Allen

Names listed in parentheses represent absences

Also present an estimated audience of 25 interested persons

Manager Burt Bundy

Assistant Pat Brown, Recording Secretary

Resources Agency

Cal DWR

Tim Ramirez  
Adam Henderson

- 2) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, UNSCHEDULED MATTERS** – A member of the audience requested an agenda item for the August board meeting addressing a conflict of interest question raised at a previous public workshop; specifically, a formal opinion from the State Attorney General's office regarding Burt Bundy's roles as a member of The State Reclamation Board and Manager of the SRCA. At the time the question was raised, Pete Rabbon, Manager of The Reclamation Board, indicated this issue had been looked at prior to Burt's appointment to the Board but he would address the issue with the Attorney General; it was suggested there should be a follow up with Pete first to see what has taken place before proceeding. Scott Clemons, WCB, announced an August 30<sup>th</sup> meeting of the WCB to discuss the purchase of water rights from a property owner on Battle Creek. Denny Bungarz announced a 10/22 "Watershed Partnerships Project" workshop he would like to attend as a representative of the SRCA Board; he will bring information from the workshop back to the Board. Marie Sullivan, FWS, announced there will be a two week Watershed Partnerships

seminar offered by CALFED September 17<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup>. Information is available at Baydeltawatershed.org.

- 3) **Consent Calendar** – It was moved by Doug White, seconded by Brendon Flynn to approve the June 28, 2001 minutes. Motion passed by unanimous vote of the Board.
- 4) **MANAGER'S REPORT** Burt Bundy introduced Les Heringer who updated the group on the M&T/Llano Seco pumps situation. He discussed the July 18<sup>th</sup> meeting where Stillwater Science presented the results of their study. The short-term recommendation involves moving the gravel bar back to its 1995 line; there were several alternatives suggested for the long-term, each of which would require a great deal more study. Burt noted he will be setting up a meeting in Sacramento to discuss funding for the short-term work. Burt discussed the progress at Hamilton City; a meeting was held between landowners, HCCSD, and the COE to discuss possible levee locations. The COE will continue with both the Section 205 and the Comp. Study IP. There will be another meeting August 13<sup>th</sup> at the Hamilton City Fire Hall for interested stakeholders. Burt stated he will attend a meeting on August 22<sup>nd</sup> concerning offstream storage and the impacts their activities have on the Sacramento River. Daryl Peterson and Greg Golet from TNC were introduced to discuss sub-reach planning. Greg began with a general discussion of subreach management which represents planning over a larger geographic scale and noted the common goals they have with the SRCA. Daryl discussed how to define a sub-reach, the intent of subreach planning, and some of the current planning activities, including Beehive Bend and Hamilton City. Burt noted TNC will be putting in for a grant through CALFED for a Colusa sub-reach and they have asked the SRCA to be involved. There was discussion at the executive committee meeting about the idea; Burt asked for direction on the Colusa sub-reach plan with TNC. Denny suggested Burt work with TNC, Doug White and Ben Carter to discuss what level of involvement the SRCA might want to commit to and come back to the Board. Burt noted the CALFED PSP will be out the first week of August with a turn around time of September 21<sup>st</sup>. Tim Ramirez, Resources Agency, noted that CALFED will put them through a rigorous review process and there will be a time where recommended projects will be available for public review, but it will be at the end. Ben noted that the executive committee had discussed the process and had concerns about projects coming to the Board in draft form, being approved, and then changed when the proposal was finalized which could change whether or not it fits the SRCA guidelines. Tim suggested getting a commitment from people making the proposal that the project will not change from draft form. Tim noted that when a packet is available, he will let the SRCA know immediately; Tim was also asked to give the SRCA a heads-up on any activity on the Sacramento River. Burt discussed a draft proposal review he had developed and discussed with executive committee earlier as need to have one in place for any potential projects in the Conservation Area, not just CALFED projects. Burt made available a copy of the draft proposal review and asked for input on this process. The SRCA staff sent a letter of support regarding TNC's request for a re-allocation of funds to be used to develop a public use strategy. TNC is talking to agencies and the SRCA, to develop a scope of work for this study, hopefully by the next meeting. Involvement of the SRCA brings in a larger area and includes the counties, which need to be involved in this process.

## 5) **BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Ben discussed the executive committee meeting held earlier and points of discussion. The committee decided they would review the SRCA budget on a quarterly basis. Staff is working on the budget for next year and will bring a draft to the August committee meeting. A meeting was held on July 12<sup>th</sup> of the Landowners Assurances Committee with eleven in attendance. Discussion focused on what the committee was there to do; specifically, the scope, objectives and deliverables. The generalized feeling was that the Good Neighbor Policy is the core of this committee. They will meet again on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 p.m., at the Colusa Fair Board office. A question was asked about the Legacy Grant (TNC) and Landowners Assurances, if there are one in the same? Ben noted they were separate but hopefully can work together to address these issues. Doug White stated the committee was addressing many of the concerns that the landowners have expressed and feels it is headed in the right direction; hopefully, will it can mollify some fears.

Denny Bungarz discussed the PILT/Economic Committee. Denny noted the objectives are the same as those of the Landowner Assurances Committee. He has asked Jane Dolan, Vince Minto, Marlyce Myers and Allan Fulton to be on the committee and asked for additional people.

Burt reported on the Outreach Committee which is looking at an expanded, informational brochure. Hopefully, they will bring a recommendation back to the Board by the next meeting date.

TAC Report – The TAC reviewed the proposed handbook amendments for recommendation to the Board. Those recommendations will be discussed fully under agenda item #6 so TAC report was very brief to allow moving forward with that discussion. Burt mentioned an upcoming meeting on August 16<sup>th</sup> at the Heidrick Ag Building in Woodland where there will be discussions on the Biological Opinion, Tulelake, and the Klamath.

- 6) **HANDBOOK AMENDMENTS** – Tom Evans asked that the Board consider the three inclusions he had suggested at the TAC. Brendon asked for clarification on the amendment process for tonight. Burt noted the Board has the option of accepting the proposed amendment, or a modification of the amendment, for recommendation to adopt at the amendment review meeting, or can choose not to move forward. Discussion began on the proposed amendments with the following determinations:

**Chapter 3, Pg. 3-11 Inner River Zone – Reach 1** - Denny Bungarz moved/seconded by Doug White that the Board accept the language for Reach 1 and direct the staff to move forward with the amendment process. Motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Language - Attachment I)

**Chapter 5, Pg. 5-10 Inner River Zone – Reach 3** - Les Heringer addressed the Board concerning the additional language he had suggested be added to the inner river zone in Reach 3. This language was forwarded to the SRCA staff after the July 19<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting. Russell Young moved/seconded by Jane Dolan that the Board approve the language for Reach 3, with the addition of Les Heringer's language, and the staff move forward with the amendment process. Burt suggested it not be added to Reach 3 but as a stand-alone statement someplace else in the Handbook. There was further discussion as to whether this additional language belongs in the Reach 3 inner river zone or under Inner River Zone guidelines that would encompass all reaches. There was also concern about adopting language that had not been discussed at the TAC; the issue was discussed, but not the language. (A typographical error was noted in the language, 5-year erosion....., should read

50-year erosion).....Question by Marc Faye. Motion passed 12 –1 with Mel Dodgin noting that he felt it was inappropriate to add language that had not been reviewed by the TAC. (See Language -Attachment I)

**Chapter 6, Pg. 6-11 Inner River Zone – Reach 4** – Brendon Flynn moved/seconded by Doug White that the Board accept the language for Reach 4 and direct the staff to move forward with the amendment process. Lewis Bair suggested including Les Heringer’s proposed language in the Reach 4 definition also. Denny suggested the TAC look at this and decide if this language should be someplace else, not add to the definition now. Denny Bungarz moved/seconded by Don Anderson to direct the TAC to review the language by Les to determine placement in the Handbook. Both Motions passed by unanimous vote. (See Language – Attachment I)

**Section I-5 Hardpoints and Impacts of Bank Stabilization on Riparian Habitat** – Denny Bungarz moved/seconded by Brendon Flynn that the Board accept the Hardpoint/Bank Stabilization language and to direct staff to move forward with the amendment process. Motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Language – Attachment I)

**Glossary, Pg. H-4 Ag Conservation Area** – A suggestion was made that the language for this area move forward with direction to the TAC that they continue to work on it. The feeling was that this language, though still needing modification, would be better than the current Handbook language. Denny Bungarz moved/seconded by Russell Young that the Board accept the Ag Conservation Area language and direct the staff to move forward with the amendment process. Because this was not presented to the Board in the strike/underline format, Ben read the old language from the Handbook and made sure it was understood the old language in the glossary would be deleted in its entirety and the new language inserted. Question called by Russell Young. Motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Language – Attachment I)

Tim suggested that the Advisory Council and MOA signatories be advised of any directions made to the TAC from the Board; those directions should be included with the letter that goes out to them.

Denny Bungarz moved/seconded by Glenn Hawes that the Amendment Review meeting date be set for September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2001.

- 7) **AGENCY REPORTS** – Dan Castleberry, US F&WS, informed the Board that Field Supervisor Wayne White and Lt. Col. Robert O’Brien were not able to attend the meeting to report on the progress on the Biological Opinion. Dan noted that there has been progress; there has been a non-jeopardy agreement that will allow construction to begin at RM 149, hopefully in the fall. The representatives hope to attend the August meeting at which time the agreement should be finalized.
- 8) **Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Brown  
Recording Secretary

▪ **Reach 1** – Chapter 3, Pg. 3-11

“The Inner River Zone Guideline for Reach 1 consists of the combined width of the 100-year meanderbelt and recent river alluvium, including both channel and over-bank deposits, within the Sacramento River Conservation Area.”

▪ **Reach 3** – Chapter 5, Pg. 5-10

“The Inner River Zone Guideline within Reach 3 consists of the area of the 100-year meanderbelt combined with 50-year erosion projections, and does not compromise the structural integrity of the existing state or federally authorized flood control levees and structures or conflict with the operation and maintenance jurisdiction of local maintaining entities as designated by The Reclamation Board. The IRZ guideline does not include the weir or by-pass areas. A modification to the application of the meander portion of the foregoing guidelines to permit a restriction of the Sacramento River’s meander patterns may be necessary where studies indicate unobstructed meander, as defined, could impair the operational viability of public and private facilities considered to be protected hard points.

▪ **Reach 4** – Chapter 6, Pg. 6-11

“The Inner River Zone Guideline within Reach 4 consists of the floodway within the existing federally authorized flood control levees, and does not compromise the integrity of the levee structure or conflict with the operation and maintenance jurisdiction of local maintaining entities as designated by The Reclamation Board. The IRZ guideline does not include the weir or by-pass areas.”

▪ **“Hard Points” and Impacts of Bank Stabilization on Riparian Habitat – Section I-5**

“The SB1086 program considers bank stabilization an implementation tool that, when used carefully, can further the goals of the program. Specifically, there are places along the river where bank stabilization will be necessary to limit the meander to the inner river zone. This limitation will take into account the potential need to protect existing land uses including agriculture and structural “hard points” such as buildings, bridges, pumping plants, flood control structures and levees from bank erosion. A structural “hard point” is defined as a structure or group of structures within the area of recent river meander, that because of various attributes, including but not limited to, historic location, public and private investment, and government commitment, is deemed necessary to be protected from river movement. It is the intent and goal to expedite the permit process for protection of these structural hard points as discussed on pages 9-7 through 9-9. When a need is identified, and other alternatives have been considered, the most effective, economically feasible, and least environmentally damaging techniques should be used.

The effect of bank stabilization on natural ecological processes along the Sacramento River is discussed in other areas of the Handbook (sections 2-2, 2-5, 2-33, and 9-6). Decisions on the location of bank protection should be made on a site-specific basis in cooperation with participating landowners. Funding mechanisms for bank protection may vary depending on funding sources and should be written into the site-specific contract.

▪ **Proposed Draft Language – Ag Conservation Area**

Sacramento River Conservation Area (SRCA): The 222 miles of the Sacramento River and the adjacent 213,000 acres of land extending from Keswick Dam in Shasta County south to the town of Verona in Sutter County. The SRCA is influenced by the river and recognized as important for the preservation of existing habitat. The area is made up of the Inner River Zone (IRZ) as defined in each of the four reaches, and the Agricultural Conservation Area (ACA). The IRZ is essential for preservation of existing riparian habitat as well as restoration of previous zones of riparian habitat. Much of the ACA is in agriculture and is recognized as having both economical and environmental importance. The ACA is the area within the SRCA and outside of the IRZ that is designated agricultural by the local jurisdiction responsible for land use.